DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 740 TM 017 802

AUTHOR Bauer, Sally; And Others
TITLE Controlling Curricular Change through State-Mandated Testing: Teacher's Views and Perceptions.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany. Evaluation Consortium.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *Educational Change; *Elementary School Teachers; Evaluation Utilization; Grade 4; Grade 6; Intermediate Grades; Likert Scales; Mail Surveys; Science Tests; Social Studies; *State Programs; *Teacher Attitudes; *Testing Programs; Test Use
IDENTIFIERS Measurement Driven Instruction; *Program Evaluation Tests NY

ABSTRACT

The perceptions of elementary school teachers toward the initiation of the New York State program evaluation tests (PETs) in science and social studies were studied. In New York, the PETs are intended to assess the local instructional program, rather than evaluate students. The social studies (grade 6) and science (grade 4) PETs were implemented in 1987-88 and 1989, respectively. Both tests are driven by the state syllabus for elementary school social studies and science. The following groups of 600 teachers each were sampled: (1) fourth-grade teachers; (2) sixth-grade teachers; and (3) teachers for kindergarten through third-grade and fifth-grade. Overall, 477 teachers (27%) responded to a Likert-type mail survey. Responses of fourth-grade and sixth-grade teachers were analyzed for this study. Teachers in general agreed with statements about why program evaluation is conducted, but they also perceived PETs as an assessment of student and teacher performance and a means of encouraging teachers to teach social studies and science. Teachers indicated some general negative attitudes toward the PETs and had mixed responses concerning how PETs were being perceived and used in their schools. Fourth-grade teachers, who had one more year of experience with the test, were somewhat more positive about the usefulness of the test and were more likely to have changed their teaching as a result of the PETs. Both groups reported including changes in teaching strategies that reflected the structure of the tests. It is too early to tell if changes in content coverage and the real adoption of the syllabus will occur as a result of these tests. Four tables present study data, and a 10-item list of references is included. (SLD)

ED340740

TM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sally McLaughlin Bauer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CONTROLLING CURRICULAR CHANGE THROUGH STATE-MANDATED TESTING: TEACHER'S VIEWS AND PERCEPTIONS

Sally Bauer
Sandra Mathison
Eileen Merriam
Kathleen Toms

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts April 17, 1990.

Address correspondence to:
Sally McLaughlin Bauer
Evaluation Consortium, Education B-10
University at Albany, SUNY
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

(518) 442-5027

TM017802

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper is part of a larger study conducted by members of the Evaluation Consortium at SUNY Albany. The Consortium consists of advanced doctoral students from the departments of Educational Theory and Practice and Educational Psychology and Statistics. It is under the direction of Drs. Sandra Mathison and Dianna Newman from the department of Educational Theory and Practice. Thanks are extended to Dr. Anna Lobosco and Ming Xu for their assistance on this project.

CONTROLLING CURRICULAR CHANGE THROUGH STATE-MANDATED TESTING:

TEACHER'S VIEWS AND PERCEPTIONS

As a response to *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (1983) and *Educating Americans for the 21st Century* (1983) many states began efforts to reform their curriculum. This reform has taken the form of proposed initiatives in curriculum development and student assessment.

In keeping with recent trends in educational reform, New York State has recently revised its science and social studies curriculum. The state education department has also developed program evaluation tests as a means of assessing implementation. The intent of this study is to provide information on the perceptions of elementary teachers toward the initiation of the program evaluation test in science and social studies.

RATIONALE

Standardized tests and educational standards have been at the core of the debate over educational reform. Used to develop, maintain, and raise standards some forms of standardized tests were initiated over one hundred years ago (Resnick, 1980). The use of standardized tests as a form of control over the curriculum extends this debate beyond education into a discussion on authority and power.

The communication of educational information in numeric terms is comfortable to many, and perceived trustworthy (Airasian, 1987). Kelly (1982) believes this opinion of tests to be linked with industrialization and the mechanization of an increasingly meritocratic society. Be that as it may, it is a fact that American schooling is increasingly carried out through the use of tests. Contributing to the widespread use of tests is the level of acceptance of the general public to testing and the perceived usefulness of tests to the decision-makers.

Airasian identifies two uses for tests: control, and the improvement of standards. Within these two uses he outlines the roles of mandated testing: to monitor the system or to certify individual performance. The two uses for tests, control and improvement of standards, are not exclusive. Indeed, the tests under discussion here can be seen to perform both functions.

Salganik (1985) talks about objectives as process controls, and tests as output control. Since processes are difficult to measure, tests can become a mechanism of quality control or quality assurance. Madaus (1985) states that testing initiated for improvement may have the opposite effect. He believes the tests undermine the teachers professional judgment. To Madaus, the test develops a history of past tests, the curriculum becomes the test. His support of this view necessitates the assumption that the implicit test curriculum takes precedent over any other

explicit curriculum. Kelly (1984) is not concerned about teachers who teach toward or for a test, as long as the test is worthy of such use. This philosophy is shared by Popham, et. al.(1984) who believe that measurement is a catalyst of instructional improvement; the concern should be to improve the measurement, not criticize its impact on instruction. Kelly, though, goes on to say that there should be concern over the teacher who teaches the test, and about curricula that are test bound. "There is much that we do not measure that can be learned" Kelly says, "...there is much that we teach that is not measured. All tests are samples." (p.10)

The use of tests to set standards has been examined by Gipps (1988). She extends her discussion to include the effect of test results on the teaching process. Three issues are addressed. First, she states that the results of tests influence instruction as teachers change in an effort to teach to the test. In addition, more time on task may be devoted to subjects that are tested. Lastly, she states that tests can sometimes be "...an engine of covert curriculum reform in order to enrich the curriculum..."(p.31).

The decision to use a test to reform the curriculum is important in its intent. The decisions on curricular input are increasingly made at state level and implemented locally (Airasian, 1987). A test becomes either high-stake or low-stake depending upon whether it is perceived as important through its use as an indicator within a decision frame.

This control of the curriculum is a key issue for educators since a high-stakes test transfers control of the curriculum to the agency which sets the test (Madaus, 1988).

A decision made at the state level is a reflection of the hierarchical, top down approach that perpetuates the notion that the people in power are more knowledgeable. Through this mechanism, the SED knows what is important to change and conveys this message to the local level.

BACKGROUND OF THE NEW YORK STATE TESTING PROGRAM

In the late 1970's, the standard of Middle School level Social Studies and Science was a cause of concern to the New York State Board of Regents. Central to this issue was the perception that both subjects were being ignored by elementary school teachers. The New York State Department of Education decided to address these concerns initially through a revision of their Social Studies and Science curriculum. The result was an integrated syllabus in each program that identified learner outcomes and guided the curriculum.

Concurrently, the Regents Action Plan and Commissioner's Regulations were being developed as part of the educational reform movement. The Board of Regents felt that there should be greater accountability for the educational outcomes. it was felt that to simply encourage, or mandate, utilization of the syllabi would not achieve the desired goal.

It was proposed that testing would be used to assess implementation of the new curricula. Social Studies and Science were the areas that did not have pupil evaluation program tests (PEP) at the elementary level. Feedback from across the state at both the teacher and supervisory level was against the institution of more PEP tests. Instead, it was decided by the Bureaus of Social Studies and Science that a Program Evaluation Test was the correct approach to align classroom practices with state objectives.

The New York State Education Law provides for the distinction between pupil evaluation tests and program evaluation tests. Pupil evaluation program tests (PEP) are defined as those "State tests in reading, writing or mathematics administered in grade six or below" (Part 100.1, section d). Whereas, program evaluation tests are intended to provide an "assessment of the local instructional program by means of written tests administered to students and other measurement techniques" (Part 100.1, section h).

The Program Evaluation Tests

This type of program evaluation rests on the three basic assumptions related to school and program improvement. First, in order to be effective, program improvement efforts must involve local staff and relate to building level needs in local schools and districts. Second, effective evaluation involves not only testing students, but also obtaining information about such elements as materials,

resources used, staff development needed, and level of program implementation. Third, given guidance in collecting and analyzing such data, school personnel will be better informed and, therefore, better able to make collaborative decisions about program improvement. The decision to reform the science and social studies curricula in the elementary schools in New York State led to the introduction of these tests. Both tests are syllabus driven.

Elementary Social Studies Program Evaluation Test

During the 1987-88 academic year, the Elementary Social Studies Program Evaluation Test was implemented in all sixth grade classrooms. The test consists of a 50 item multiple choice instrument. In addition to the objective test, a second measure, an essay test is required. The test also consisted of an optional participation project, and optional informal assessment of community resources, staff development, and classroom climate. The target population is sixth grade students and appropriate school staff. Manuals with suggestions for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information have also been developed for local use. In May 1991, it will enter its third cycle. The Social Studies Bureau is presently developing evaluation test protocols for grades seven and eight.

Elementary Science Program Evaluation Test (ESPET)

The Elementary Science Program Evaluation Test (ESPET) was administered for the first time to all fourth grade pupils in the spring of 1989. This test consisted of two required components: an objective test and a manipulative test. In addition to the required tests, five optional instruments were available. The objective test was content oriented; while the manipulative test covered inquiry and communication skills. It was the intent of the designers of the required tests to align classroom practices with the state objectives reflected in the syllabus. The optional instruments were developed with the goal to enable schools to examine dimensions of their programs beyond classroom practices. One instrument was designed to gather information on student attitudes about science, and the remaining assessed the program environment as perceived by students, teachers, administrators, and parents/guardians. It is the intent of the Science Bureau to pursue the development of a grade six science test and eventually, second grade testing.

The decision to make the attitude and environment component optional was not without debate. The Test Bureau of the State Education Department decided that the attitude assessment is not as objectively "hard" as content testing. As the bureau with the responsibility to defend all test items, they argued that they could not defend the validity and the reliability of the attitude and environment items.

As a result, the Bureaus of Social Studies and Science deferred to the Test Bureau.

Curriculum Reform

Change must be implemented as well as planned. In an ideal world, the new science and social studies curricula would have been voluntarily implemented. Had this been so, the ideal program evaluation test would have ensued. Indeed, the results of this survey show that the perceptions of program evaluation held by the teachers questioned are nearly ideal.

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

Sample

A stratified random sample, identified through the New York State Education Department, was composed of 1800 full time teachers. Three distinct groups of 600 teachers were sampled. Fourth grade teachers were chosen as a unit because this was the level for the Elementary Science Program Evaluation Test (ESPET). Sixth grade teachers comprised the second set of potential respondents. They had experience with the first Program Evaluation Test, administered the previous year. Given to all sixth grade students in the state, this test reflected the program in Social Studies. The last group was comprised of K through third and fifth grade teachers. The survey instrument and a cover letter explaining the intent of the study were mailed to each potential participant in April 1989. The ESPET was

scheduled to be conducted in early May throughout New York State. It was our intention to get responses from the teachers within a short time after the test had been administered. As a result we determined that a single mailing would suffice. Although we surmised that obtaining responses at that time of the year would be difficult, we hoped that the large sample would afford us a sufficient response for descriptive purposes. Of those surveyed, 477 (27%) provided usable responses.

Instrument

The instrument designed to survey teacher perceptions toward the initiation of the program evaluation tests was intended to elicit information about five major areas.

1. general perceptions of program evaluation,
2. perceptions of the NYS Science and Social Studies program evaluations,
3. use of formal and informal support systems designed to inform teachers about the program evaluation process,
4. use of evaluation process and outcomes,and
5. the effect of the program evaluation tests on curriculum and instruction.

The instrument consisted of Likert type items with the ranges, strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Other types of close ended questions were also included.

For the purpose of this paper, we will examine the responses of fourth and sixth grade teachers to the initiation of the program evaluation tests.

ANALYSIS

Because of the exploratory, qualitative focus of this study, only descriptive analyses were done. Means, standard deviations, and percentages were computed for each Likert type item on the questionnaire. Results are reported for 4th grade science teachers (N=176) and 6th grade social studies (N=172) separately and together (N=347). One teacher reported teaching both 4th grade science and 6th grade social studies. Four areas of teacher perception were assessed: 1) general program evaluation purposes; 2) NYS Program Evaluation Test purposes; 3) Effect of the NYS Pets on school factors (teachers, students, programs); and 4) Effect of NYS PETs on classroom instruction. Internal reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) for these scales ranged from .64 for the effect of the PETs on school factors scale to .90 for the perceptions of general program evaluation purpose scale. The reliability coefficient of the the school effect scale is probably lower than the other scales because the items in this scale cover a wide range of school areas including effect on teachers, students, and programs. Thus the items would be expected to be less homogeneous.

RESULTS

Teacher Perception of General Program Evaluation Purpose (Table 1).

In general both 4th grade science and 6th grade social studies teachers slightly agreed or agreed that program evaluation assumes a variety of purposes (Means for these items ranged from 4.23 to 4.73). Teachers felt that program evaluations are conducted to measure program credibility, determine if program goals are met, assess implementation of a program, determine how to improve a program, and determine the outcomes of the program. (See Table 1, Appendix). Thus teachers agreed with both formative and summative purposes for evaluation. No important differences were found between 4th and 6th grade teachers on these items so means for the combined group are reported.

Teacher Perception of NYS PET Purposes (Table 2)

Teachers also agreed with a number of purposes for the NYS program evaluation tests (See Table 2, Appendix). Teachers slightly agreed or agreed that the PETs were conducted to assess the implementation of syllabi, and to evaluate the social studies and science programs (X=4.74 and 4.60 respectively). (No important differences were found between 4th and 6th grade teachers on these items so means for the combined group are reported.)

In addition to these more traditional purposes for program evaluations, teachers also felt that the PETs were conducted to evaluate individual pupil (X=4.20) and teacher

(X=3.60) performance, and to encourage teachers to teach these subjects (X=4.05). Thus, while teachers saw valid formative and summative purposes for conducting the PETs in assessing social studies and science programs, and agreed with positive purposes for program evaluation in general, they saw the PETs as high-stakes judgments of both their own and their students'performance. This perception of the test as a performance measure, more so of student performance, is probably a direct result of the way the PETs were implemented. It may also reflect general teacher perception of what program evaluation is (i.e.testing). Calling these program evaluations "tests" denotes individual assessment and changes the focus to pupil evaluations regardless of the state agency's attempt to couch the tests in program evaluation terms. In any case, teachers were not duped by the loophole in NYS Education law that program evaluation tests are intended to provide assessment of the local instructional program. Rather the PETs are seen as simply PEPs under an assumed name. This is further compounded by the fact that these tests are given in fourth and sixth grade when there are no PEP tests administered. It is also clear that teachers are receiving mixed messages about why program evaluation is done.

Unfortunately, teachers were not asked to indicate if they felt evaluation in general is conducted to assess individual performance in the "general purpose of evaluation scale." It would be interesting in a future study to see if

the perception of the NYS PETs as assessing individual performance would carry over to reflect general perceptions of evaluation purpose. Logically one would assume the two would be correlated.

Effect of PETs on School Level Factors (Teachers, Programs, Students) (Table 3)

Both 4th grade science and 6th grade social studies teachers felt that teachers in their schools did not have positive attitudes toward the PETs (X=2.99). No data was collected on why teachers feel this way but negative attitudes may be related to teacher perceptions of the use of standardized tests (Salmon-Cox, 1981), the high stakes nature of the tests, and the fact that teachers were against instituting more tests.

Both groups of teachers felt that all teachers in their buildings were responsible for preparing students for the PETs (X=3.90). However, despite this feeling, both groups slightly agreed that they (4th grade science and 6th grade social studies teachers) were primarily responsible for preparing students for these tests (X=3.93, and X=3.67 respectively). While the responsibility for delivering the science and social studies programs was seen as ideally shared, the teachers who teach the subjects in the grades in which the tests are given bear the brunt of the responsibility for preparing students.

Assessment of PET impact on teachers at other grade levels could not be done because of low response rates from

these groups. One would expect these groups to see the tests as lower stake than 4th and 6th grade teachers. However, if pupil performance on the tests is low, there may be administrative pressure on all teachers to adjust their teaching accordingly. Future study of the effects of the PETs on science and social studies teaching at other levels is warranted.

It also appears that teachers are experiencing a great deal of pressure to have their students do well on these tests (X=4.33). This was true for both 4th and 6th grade teachers. Given the high stakes nature of these tests and the nation's passion for standardized test scores as a yardstick for determining success, this is not surprising. In spite of this pressure, teachers in general felt that the students in their schools were well prepared for the tests (X=4.20).

In general teachers did not feel that the PETs adequately reflected the science and social studies programs in their schools. 4th grade science teachers slightly disagreed that the science PET reflected the science program in their school (X=3.31) and 6th grade social studies teachers reported the same response in regard to the social studies test (X=2.92). Thus, the tests are not seen as adequate assessments of these two programs. Further most of teachers (67%) indicated that they occasionally or almost never use the NYS syllabi in planning their lessons. These findings indicate that despite the intent of NYS Education

to persuade teachers to implement the syllabi, this has not happened directly. Rather the test itself has been the focus of any change that is occurring.

Teacher Perceptions of the Effects of PETS on Instruction (Table 4)

Teachers reported wanting to know the content of the tests so that they could prepare their students to take them (X=3.85 4th, 3.99 6th). Fourth grade science teachers also indicated that they had included more hands on activities in their lessons since the PETs (X=4.06) and 6th grade social studies indicated they had included more student participation projects and writing assignments in their lessons since PET implementation (X=3.66). (The level of agreement on the part of 6th grade teachers may be lower because they may have implemented greater changes the previous year to accommodate the test). However, teachers in both groups did not report spending more time teaching either of these two topics than in previous years. Nor did teachers indicate covering a wider range of topics in these subject areas since implementation of the tests. Thus, while teachers have not expanded their classroom curricula as a result of these tests, nor have they necessarily narrowed it (YET!), teachers appear to be making changes in the strategies they use for teaching these subjects to reflect the way the tests are written (i.e. through hands on activities in science, and through writing and student participation projects in social studies). Therefore, while

teachers report not using the syllabi very often they have embraced the test as part of their instructional repertoire.

4th grade science and 6th grade social studies teachers differed in their perceptions of the value of the information the tests would provide for improving their programs. Fourth grade teachers agreed that the science PET would provide valuable information for improving science programs (X=4.02) and reported similar perceptions about the social studies PET (X=3.72). Sixth grade social studies teachers felt that neither the social studies PET (X=3.30) nor the science PET (X=3.32) would provide valuable information for improving those programs. This may be because social studies teachers had had experience with the PETs the previous year and so were more pessimistic than the science teachers, or it may be that there is a difference in perceived quality of the two tests. Social studies teachers may have found the social studies PET to be without value and transferred this perception to the science PETs. Science teachers may have seen the science PET as useful and transferred this perception to the social studies PET.

4th grade science teachers slightly agreed that both the social studies and science tests reflected what needed to be taught in those areas (X=3.87, and X=3.95 respectively). 6th grade social studies teachers slightly disagreed with both of these statements (X=3.18, and X=3.34 respectively) again reflecting a difference in perceptions of the tests between these two groups.

DISCUSSION

The results of the study are mixed. There was also a great deal of variability across responses resulting in means that do not reflect a high degree of intensity toward agreement or disagreement. Findings must be taken in light of these factors. However, some general patterns can be discerned.

While teachers in general agree with general statements about why program evaluation is conducted, they perceive the PETs as an assessment of pupil and teacher performance and a means for encouraging teachers to teach social studies and science. Teachers also indicate general negative attitudes toward the PETs. This is probably due to the high stakes nature of the test, the perception that the PETs are really more unwanted PEPs, and/or general negative perceptions of standardized testing on the part of teachers. The "program evaluation test" terminology also equates program evaluation with "tests" and thus may reinforce already negative perceptions about the usefulness of program evaluation for teacher classroom decision making.

Teachers had mixed responses to how they felt the PETs were being perceived and used in their schools. However, 4th grade science teachers were somewhat more positive about the usefulness of the PETs, the adequacy of the tests in reflecting science and social studies programs in their schools, and the role the tests play in clarifying what

needs to be taught. This may be due to the different formats of the two tests or to prior experience with the PETs on the part of social studies teachers.

4th grade teachers were also more likely to have changed their teaching as a result of the PETs than were social studies teachers. This is probably due to the fact that the social studies teachers were giving the PETs for the second time and may have changed their teaching in the prior year. It may also be due to the perception on the part of 4th grade teachers that hands on, experiential learning is a viable alternative teaching strategy. Neither group reported spending more time on these two subjects since the implementation of the tests, nor did they cover a wider range of topics in social studies or science. However, both groups reported including changes in teaching strategies which reflected the structure of the tests. This reflects an indirect adoption of the NYS Education Department syllabi (a desired response on the part of that agency). It is too early to tell if changes in content coverage (true adoption of the syllabus) whether narrowing or expanding, will occur as a result of these tests. Future studies should examine more closely (perhaps through classroom observation or longitudinal review of teacher lesson plans) to see what changes occur over time.

It is assumed however, that changes will occur once teachers have a better idea of just how high the stakes are for these two tests. If results are reported in annual CAR assessments or if schools are ranked on results of the PETs, there will be great pressure to change non-standard curriculums to reflect the state syllabus and teachers will "reform."

REFERENCES

Airasian, P. (1987). State Mandated Testing and Educational Reform: Context and Consequences. **American Journal of Education**: May 1987: 393-412.

Gipps, C. (1988). The Debate over Standards and the Uses of Testing. **British Journal of Educational Studies: 36(1)**: 21-33.

Kelly, E. (1984). Testing in American School Reform. Unpublished document. November 1984.

Madaus, G.F. (1988). The Influence of Testing on the Curriculum, in Laurel N. Tanner (Ed.) **Critical Issues in Curriculum.** Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Madaus, G.F. (1985). Test scores as administrative mechanisms in educational policy. **Phi Delta Kappan, 66(9)**: 628-633.

Popham, J.W., Cruse, K., Rankin, S., Sandifer, P.D., and Williams, P. (1984). Measurement-Driven Instruction: It's on the Road. **Phi Delta Kappan 66(9)**: 607-610.

Salganik, L.H. (1985). Why Testing Reforms are so Popular and How They are Changing Education. **Phi Delta Kappan: 66(9)**: 607-610.

Salmon-Cox, L. (1981). Teachers and standardized achievement tests: What's really happening? **Phi Delta Kappan**, 62, 631-633.

Reports:

Educating Americans for the 21st Century. (1983) U.S. National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology: National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.

A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. (1983). United States National Commission on Excellence in Education. Washington, D.C.

TABLE 1

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF GENERAL PROGRAM EVALUATION

Program Evaluations are conducted to:	4th grade				6th grade			
	X	SD	%A	%D	X	SD	%A	%D
Provide a measure of program credibility	4.80	1.16	90.5	9.5	4.51	1.30	83.8	16.2
Determine if program goals are met	4.89	1.13	89.4	10.6	4.57	1.27	85.0	15.0
Assess implementation of a program	4.72	1.16	88.2	11.8	4.38	1.25	80.3	19.7
Determine how to improve a program	4.59	1.33	81.2	18.8	3.99	1.50	67.6	32.4
Determine the outcomes of a program	4.39	1.38	77.8	22.2	4.05	1.46	72.3	27.7

Coding: 1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=slightly disagree
4=slightly agree 5=agree 6=strongly agree

TABLE 2

TEACHER PERCEPTION OF NYS SOCIAL STUDIES AND SCIENCE PROGRAM EVALUATION TESTS

The Social Studies and Science PETs are conducted to:	X	SD	%A	%D	X	SD	%A	%D
Encourage teachers to teach those subjects	4.27	1.71	71.8	28.2	3.83	1.79	61.3	38.7
Assess implementation of the NYS syllabi	4.95	1.05	91.2	8.8	4.54	1.33	82.8	17.2
Evaluate pupil performance in Social Studies and Science	4.27	1.54	70.9	29.1	4.13	1.47	75.4	24.6
Evaluate the performance of teachers	3.76	1.68	59.3	40.7	3.53	1.64	56.0	44.0

Coding: 1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=slightly disagree
4=slightly agree 5=agree 6=strongly agree

Table 3
TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF PET EFFECT ON SCHOOL FACTORS

	4th Gr				6th Gr			
	X	SD	%A	%D	X	SD	%A	%D
Teachers in my school have positive attitudes toward PETs	3.09	1.27	43.9	56.1	2.88	1.38	35.6	74.4
All teachers in the building are responible for preparing std. for PETs	4.11	1.69	65.7	34.3	3.67	1.77	54.4	45.6
There is a lot of pressure on teachers in my school for students to do well on PETs	4.26	1.44	78.4	21.6	4.38	1.56	72.8	27.2
Students in my school are well prepared for the PETs	4.15	1.23	77.6	22.4	4.25	1.20	75.7	24.3
PETs will provide valuable info for improving SC program in my school	4.09	1.41	70.3	29.7	3.32	1.38	50.4	49.6
PETs will provide valuable info for improving SS program in my school	3.72	1.51	59.3	40.7	3.30	1.46	49.1	50.9
4th grade teachers are primarily responsible for preparing students for SC PETs	3.93	1.93	61.4	38.6	3.36	1.99	48.0	52.0
6th grade teachers are primarily responsible for preparing students for SS PETs	3.63	1.84	55.3	44.7	3.67	2.03	57.8	42.2
SC PETs adequately reflect the SC program in my school	3.31	1.45	49.1	50.9	2.90	1.39	39.1	60.9
SS PETs adequately reflect the SS program in my school	3.18	1.31	44.4	55.6	2.92	1.45	38.4	61.6

Table 4
TEACHER PERCEPTION OF PETS ON CLASSROOM TEACHING

	4th Gr				6th Gr			
	X	SD	%A	%D	X	SD	%A	%D
The SS PETs clarify what should be taught in the content area	3.87	1.58	64.5	35.5	3.18	1.58	45.1	54.9
The SC PETs clarify what should be taught in the content area	3.95	1.61	68.4	31.6	3.34	1.58	50.4	49.6
Since the implementation of the SC PETs I have included more hands-on activities in my lessions	4.06	1.67	68.6	31.4	3.57	1.54	57.9	42.1
Since the implementation of the SS PETs I have included more stu. participation projects and writing assignments in my classroom.	3.55	1.49	56.2	43.8	3.66	1.53	58.7	41.3
I need to know the content of the PETs so I can prepare my students to take the test	3.85	1.69	63.3	36.7	3.99	1.69	66.9	33.1
I have spent more time teaching science this year than in previous years	3.45	1.78	49.1	50.9	2.84	1.53	32.9	67.1
I have spent more time teaching social studies this year than in previous years	2.80	1.48	31.2	68.8	2.87	1.63	36.7	63.3
I cover a wider range of topics in my SC classes since PETs were implemented	3.25	1.69	43.3	56.7	2.86	1.45	34.8	65.2
I cover a wider range of topics in my SS classes since PETs were implemented	2.82	1.62	30.2	69.8	3.14	1.73	42.8	57.2